

Woman Suffrage

(*Six Papers*)



Should Catholic Women Vote?

The Catholic Mind

SEMI-MONTHLY

Price 5 cents; \$1.00 per year

Entered as second-class matter, October 23, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XIII, No. 23, December 8, 1915

THE AMERICA PRESS

59 East 83d Street

NEW YORK

THE CATHOLIC MIND

THE FOLLOWING NUMBERS ARE STILL OBTAINABLE:

1908

18. *Mr. Birrell's University Bill.*
19. *Genius of Cardinal Wiseman* Wilfrid Ward

1909

1. *Lord Kelvin and the Existence of God.*
H. V. Gill, S.J.
2. *Primary Education in France.*

1910

- 4, 5, 6, 8. *Catholic Missions. I, II, III, V.*
Hilarion Gil
11, 12, 13. *Calistus III and Halley's Comet.*
I, II, III.
17. *Holy Communion for Children*
19. *The Holy Eucharist in Early Canada.*
T. J. Campbell, S.J.
20, 21. *Pius X on Recent Manifestations of Modernism.*

1911

- 11, 12. *Cardinal Gibbons' Jubilee.*
14. *Protests of Pius X and Bishops of Portugal.*
17. *English Economics and Catholic Ethics.*
Michael Maher, S.J.
18. *Catholicism at Home and Abroad.*
20, 21. *Scotland in Penal Days.*
His Eminence Francis Aidan Cardinal Gasquet.
22, 24. *The Sacred College of Cardinals.*
Henry J. Swift, S.J.

1912

4. *Doctor Lingard.* John Gerard, S.J.
6, 7. *Horrors of Portuguese Prisons.*
11, 12. *Marist Missions in the Pacific. II, III.*
Rt. Rev. John J. Grimes, S.M.,
Bishop of Christ Church
17. *The People's Pope.* Michael Kenny, S.J.
24. *Father Algué's Barocyclonometer.*
New York Tribune, Dec., 1912

1913

5. *Capital Punishment.* Rev. John J. Ford, S.J.

1914

6. *Liberty of Conscience.*
Rt. Rev. John E. Gunn, D.D.
14. *Tercentenary of St. Teresa.*
15. *Freemasonry and Catholicism in America.*
Michael Kenny, S.J.

19. *Justice to Mexico.*
21. *The Needy Family and Institutions.*
R. H. Tierney
22. *The Architect's Plan.* John A. Cotter,
A. B.
23. *Mexican Liberalism.*
24. *First Encyclical of Benedict XV.*

1915

1. *The Catholic Press.* E. Hall,
Paul Baker
2. *The "Menace" and the Mails.*
3. *The Ethics of War.* Edward Masterson,
4. *Sixty Historical "Don'ts."*
James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
5. *The Jesuit Myth.* Robert Swickard,
6. *Fifty "Don'ts" of Science.*
James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
Catholics in the Y. M. C. A. Nelson B.
7. *Catholic Sociology.* Richard H. Tierney,
Newman's Alleged "Scurrility."
Paul Baker
8. *Was Shakespeare a Catholic?*
James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
9. *The Church and the Mexican Revolution.*
By a Mexican Lawyer
10. *Dante's 650th Birthday.*
James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D., Litt.
11. *Magna Charta's Centenary*
P. Guilday, Ph.D.
12. *The Church and the Sex Problem.*
Richard H. Tierney, S.J.
13. *The War's Lesson.*
Rt. Rev. Thomas O'Dwyer, D.D.
14. *Catholic Schools for Catholic Youth.*
Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D.
15. *Temperance Against Prohibition.*
Henry Munn,
16. *The Papacy.*
His Eminence Cardinal Merriam
17. *The Church and the Immigrant.*
Rev. Francis C. Kelley, S.J.
18. *The Contemporary Drama.*
James J. Daly, S.J.
19. *The Catholic School.* William D. Guthrie
20. *The Educative Influence of the Catholic Press*
Richard H. Tierney, S.J.
21. *The Church and Peace.*
Most Rev. E. J. Hanna, D.D.
22. *Mexico's Social Problem.*
By a Mexican Lawyer

Single numbers 5c. each, \$3 per hundred.

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 EAST 83D STREET, NEW YORK.

Woman Suffrage

SIX PAPERS

By MARTHA MOORE AVERY

I—THE BASIC ISSUE

WHEN the basic issue in the discussion of woman suffrage is reached, it is clearly this: Shall the family maintain its place as the unit of civil society, or shall the State establish the individual as its unit, without regard to sex? There is no mistaking the ground of this dispute once the vast amount of superficial argument is swept away from the propaganda of "Votes for Women." The notable advocates of political, economic and sex equality set forth their doctrine with a boldness which leaves no possible doubt that the Christian family is flouted. Sex functions and appetites are assumed to be merely personal concerns, as a preference for beefsteak today and fried fish tomorrow. So the law of sex independence is set down without the slightest reference to, or regard for, the Decalogue.

Broadly speaking, the advocates of woman suffrage have had the sociological field all to themselves, as really competent opposition has been rare. Indeed, no truly scientific defense of the family can be put forth by those who deny the indissolubility of the marriage bond as the foundation of the State. For if God is not the author of the family as a moral body having one head, not two, the matter is not clarified.

Only a slight barrier is set up by those who, for love of country or for love of home, oppose votes for women,

as sentimental rather than scientific reasons guide their course. Nor is humanism a cure for Feminism, for the race comes first and God not at all. These defenders confuse rather than illumine the subject, making it appear an endless discussion with the truth past finding out. Of course, from the Pragmatists, to whom racial experience is the one only mode of discovering the road to national well-being, there is no help, for the race must come to an end before men know what it is best to do, or how best to do it. No, to these various groups we may look for keenness, but not for wisdom, as they acknowledge no voice which speaks with authority but their own, and no bed-rock of truth upon which to discover that it is God's will that makes the family a moral body and so consequently the necessary unit of civil society.

Everybody sees that the family is hard pressed, some with horror, other some with trembling and with doubt. But those taking the offensive openly express satisfaction at seeing their philosophy of free-love, divorce, political equality, economic independence and sex freedom riding rough-shod over what they are pleased to view as the stupid conventions, the industrial, political and sex slavery which heretofore have kept woman from coming into her own. These morbid but sparkling minds look to see the superman born and bred when what is now well in the green shall be rotten ripe.

If the opposing forces were sharply divided, the whole Feminist movement were as an open book to the right-minded. As it is, a tangle of depraved opinion and sound thought seems in hopeless confusion. Nevertheless, the leaders of the two camps know what the fight is about: Shall God's word stand as to the creation of man and the relation of the sexes or shall modern Materialism set up

a mode of human life not fit for the dogs? Shall we have marriages, or progressively, after trial marriages, no marriages; with women equally free with men to earn their own living, if they prefer, at the "trade of motherhood?"

Alas that a babel of voices clamoring for woman's rights should so bewilder the mind of the populace, and that so much progress should have been made towards the desolation that pseudo-science has in store for her! It was love of God and obedience to law that rescued woman from the fate of the heathen world and it is nothing else but Christianity that shall save her from neopaganism.

No secondary principles will do in her defense. Neither regard for the race nor love of country is the first term in right reason. If it were, creation is before the Creator and Cæsar before God. Still less is love of home the basic reason for defense of the family as the unit of the State, else affection is set above reason. But the case is worse when the Ten Commandments are made equal to human reason. Thus one may enter the thick of confusion by following a distinguished Englishman who graciously grants to one free man as much right to "disbelieve the Bible" as to another the right to "disbelieve the Origin of Species." Truly this is "fair-play" run mad! For God has lost His authority over His creation once a man has a right to disbelieve the Book of Genesis; or, to put it negatively, as much right to discredit God's own story of creation with mankind as its crowning glory, as he has to disbelieve an already scientifically discredited theory of man's origin.

We may indeed grant that a man has the power of maintaining a perverse attitude of mind, on any subject,

but no man has a right to do so, for it is a violation of his own rational nature. It puts non-reason and reason at par. With God's authority on a level with Darwin's, both woman's rights and woman's wrongs would be past finding out.

But neither religion nor science will have it so; for science has no knowledge in conflict with the testimony of God. There is no warrant for the popular notion that complete sex independence is the highest stage of human evolution. But the positive conviction that God has told His children how man came into this world and what our rights and duties are as men and women within human society, which is more or less responsive to His love and more or less obedient to His law, has warrant not alone by faith, but by science also.

Every department of human life shows the necessary cooperation of men and women. If we take the whole sphere of human action and intellectually separate it into its four grand divisions, the civic, the economic, the social and the domestic, it may be seen that two of these departments naturally fall under the direction of men and the other two fall under the direction of women. While, if religion, good will among men, ceases to dominate the whole sphere, disorder is prevalent.

The history of all ages tells the same story. The home and social intercourse are organized and maintained by women, while politics and commerce naturally fall to the lot of men. No man ever made a home, that is the task of the woman, wife and mother. But who shall say that home is home without the husband and father? So it is with society. What woman ever achieved distinction and leadership with men as her rivals? Yet were men altogether absent, zest would be absent from the social en-

vironment and public opinion nil. Certainly the home and social intercourse are indispensable divisions of civilization. And although women lead, men have a secondary but a necessary part to perform. Women supply the comforts and graces, while men exhibit their power by supplying the material means. So with infinite beauty and strength are the characteristics of these *twain that are one*, made complementary in the building of human association.

In politics and commerce it is just the opposite. Men take to state-craft as a duck to the water, by right of natural fitness. Yet many a laurel worn by the great was plucked with the assistance of women. So with business enterprise, it is man's world, by all the signs of right reason. Yet the successes are won with the aid of women; and for the family. If, then, men and women insist upon changing the natural order, disorder will be the result.

Surely it should be simple enough that the halves of the one race have their natural tasks, designed by our Creator, for the maintenance of civil society. If we ask the science of biology as to the natural fitness of men and women, the tale is plainly told, for structure denotes function. The man's part is the positive, the projective force in life, and the woman's the receptive, the conservative force. If we go to Divine authority, to the one authentic record of human history, it tells us that this was meant to be so: "God created man to his own image: to the image of God he created him: male and female he created them." The man to lead, the woman to help.

What then, shall the demand of "equal rights" stand upon but a rebellious attempt to undo God's plan and make up the duties of the race after their own vain-glorious pattern?

II—GENESIS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The sources and development of woman suffrage show plainly that original design is discredited as a worn-out legend fit only for the childhood of the race. There is, for the progenitors of sex-rebellion, no "In the beginning"; no God's plan unrolling in time and space, from out of eternity into time; no perfect pattern marred but not ruined, by the disobedience of the first man and woman and by every man and woman save our Blessed Mother Mary.

The Darwinians and Spencerians have made popular the notion that the monogamic family is a produce of gradual evolution. Dozens of reasons are given by pseudo-scientists for its development. But, of course, as they find no basic reason for its existence, they assume no necessity for its maintenance. After all their facts and fancies have been gathered, the monogamic family is found by some to be best in producing and rearing children, as one method of breeding cattle is proved to be best fitted in securing excellent animals for domestic and commercial purposes.

Humanists have graciously acknowledged the monogamic family to be worth saving in the interest of the race. Even though might, not right, put men in possession of personal wealth, it is certain that in order to hold their ill-gotten gains, there arose the budding desire to dwell in organized communities. Splendid! Human experience in family forms is so varied that the commandment not to commit adultery is seen to be a shrewd piece of legislation to keep the family intact. The modern materialists popularized the idea that the monogamic family was found to be the self-conscious means by

which strong men secured to their own advantage and to the offspring of their loins the social results of their conquests over their unfortunate fellows. Wonderful! This securely established the dogma that private property called the monogamic family into existence and, against nature, subjected woman to man; this dogma, of course, deals the death-blow to God's creation of man and woman. It has for its authority the theory of man's origin from the monkey with the *link missing*. Worse yet, in this philosophy of life there is missing a reason for the *human desire* to leave its "fish hooks and arrows" to its own kith and kin. Besides, God being dismissed, the "*self-conscious*" enjoyment of private wealth comes from nowhere.

Too bad, to spoil a well-thumbed theory of sex equality with little matters like these! Having gathered such philosophical strength as to color public opinion, "equal rights" broke out into political action. The die was cast in rebellion! As private property and sex slavery came into the scheme of human evolution together, they must go out together, to make way for the "new society." Clearly the bursting womb of the present order shall bring forth the economic and sex independence of men and women with the consequence that the individual shall supersede the family as the unit of the "social organism."

The means seem easily at hand, when workmen vote. Therefore, shall not justice be done? By majority vote "all-the-people" may become sole owner of all the capital now owned by private persons. Surely it is plain enough that, if private property is abolished, the monogamic family must die out for want of material support, unless individual sex passion keeps it alive.

In the "new society" women will be just as free as men, though man has a handicap from nature: with no home they may seek presidential votes for John or for Arabella. At its roots, this is the "economic freedom" upon which votes for women rest. The "Communist Manifesto," 1848, set these principles down succinctly, by demanding, "abolition of all right of inheritance," and "equal liability of men and women to labor." From that time on the radical political platforms, in words more or less explicit, attacked the family and demanded votes for women. In this country as early as 1851 the demand for "universal suffrage" was made in Richmond, Va., by the Social Democrats. In Germany, the Gotha platform, 1875, demanded "universal, equal and direct suffrage." The Belgian Labor Party, 1893, demanded the abolition of the "husband's liability to support the wife or children." The Social Democratic Party of Austria, 1901, demanded "abolition of all laws subordinating woman to man in public or private life." The Socialist Party of France, 1902, demands "the abrogation of every law establishing the civil inferiority of women and natural or adulterine children." Bebel rightly says that "the Socialist Party is the only one that has made the full equality of women an integral part of its program, from [logical] necessity."

In England, before the British Parliament, 1867, John Stuart Mill, when pleading for votes for women, opened up the issue with a masterful evasion. While abstract human rights were waived as irrelevant to the issue, the rights of the family were utterly ignored. Mr. Mill rests the case solely upon expediency. "To lay the ground for a denial of the franchise to anyone, it is necessary to allege either personal unfitness or public danger." Abstract rights are truly irrelevant, but in denying the

franchise to women, the rights of the family are preserved, and so public disorder averted.

Meantime, women were not quite content to let men settle the matter. In 1848 the Woman's Rights Convention (New York) resolved to secure their "sacred right to the elective franchise." Their "Declaration of Sentiments" scathingly rehearsed woman's "wrongs." But the grievances alleged set forth proof that the husband and father was performing his political and economic duty of keeping the family intact. Abroad, Harriet Martineau was at once attacking the integrity of the family and destroying human confidence in God's Providence, by advocating the voluntary limitation of offspring *à la* Malthus. On this side of the ocean, Frances Wright, a member of Robert Owen's "New Harmony Colony," first insisted that politics is the high road to sex freedom. "Fanny" devoted her time and fortune to laying down affection as the one foundation of marriage, "kind feeling and kind action, the only religion." Margaret Fuller the while was dazzling the minds of men with the woman's version of the Concord School of Philosophy, and from Mrs. Julia Ward Howe came protestations before the Massachusetts Legislature as to the intellectual fitness of women to vote and a denial that the emancipation of women would endanger the home. Victoria Claflin Woodhull went further by memorializing Congress for woman suffrage, and presenting herself to the nation as a presidential candidate. Miss Woodhull carried logic further, advocating the doctrine of sex independence baldly. Of course, at that time the open advocacy of free love gained but a small following.

Perhaps Mary Wollstonecraft most vitally influenced the early propaganda of "political rights" for women.

Her break from a Catholic environment was violent, weakened by no Protestant ancestry. Margaret Fuller says Miss Wollstonecraft's career was the more heroic from the fact that she belonged to a class "so narrow" that women in breaking their bonds "become outlaws." In her "Vindication of the Rights of Women" Miss Wollstonecraft argues in strict materialist fashion that "sexual distinction is arbitrary" and that woman will change her character and "emulate the virtues of men" once she is emancipated from the "authority that chains" her to her "duty." Miss Wollstonecraft and Frances Wright's names head the list as a "constant inspiration" to whom are "affectionately inscribed" those volumes on "The History of Woman Suffrage," edited by Elizabeth C. Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and Matilda Joslyn Gage.

This history is voluminous. Its premise is laid upon the assumption that, under "freedom of education," "woman would not only outgrow the power of the priesthood, and religious superstition, but would invade the pulpit, interpret the Bible anew from her own standpoint, and claim an equal voice [with men] in all ecclesiastical councils." Proof that progress in woman's emancipation has been made by rebellion is cited by the authors of "The History of Woman Suffrage." "The Reformation . . . loosened the grasp of the Church upon women, and is to be looked upon as one of the most important steps in this reform. . . . When Elizabeth ascended the throne, it was not only as queen, but as the head of the newly-formed rebellious Church," and she bent "alike priest and prelate to her fiery will."

Regarding the education of children, Ellen Key has, no doubt, exerted the most powerful influence upon the Feminist propaganda. It is positive that: "At the pres-

ent moment the most demoralizing factor in education is Christian religious instruction." . . . "The children are now taught the Old Testament account of the world as absolute truth, although it wholly contradicts their physical and historical instruction." (*The Century of the Child.*)

Once a competent view of the movement demanding votes for women is had, the conclusion becomes necessary that it takes its rise in opposition to, not in logical extension from, Christian principles as related to the sexes, that the Feminist phenomenon is, in fact, but following after the fire of sex rebellion, set aflame at the time of the so-called Protestant Reformation; that the moral vision has become so obscured that both men and women are at work destroying God's authority and practically denying that the family is a moral body with the man politically and economically responsible for his wife and children as a necessary corollary.

III—POLITICAL EQUALITY

Having seen human society under its basic divisions of domestic, civil, commercial and social life, with religion as the rightful norm for action within these four spheres, we are in a position to understand clearly the ramification of the demand for political equality, as it affects the body social in all its activities. Yet political equality must find, if it may, its peculiar justification within the civil sphere, as that is where the franchise is exercised. However glibly and persistently votes are demanded for women, as a natural, a human right, without regard to sex, it is certain that the best minds which have bent to the task are agreed that the franchise, with-

in the scheme of whatsoever form of government, is a privilege, not a natural right.

Those who habitually leave out of reckoning God's order as to things human, are thereby led into much confusion, much superficial reasoning, and much hot indignation at the supposedly arbitrary exclusion of women from politics. If it be assumed without argument in proof, that fitness, expediency, is the determining principle in awarding the franchise, it is but rational to insist that first questions shall be settled first, so as to establish a solid basis upon which secondary issues may securely rest. The first question is this: What is the unit of society? Is it the individual or the family? Surely for the understanding of the structure of human society, this question must be answered, and answered rightly, before any profit can come from the discussion of the fitness of men and women for participation in political life, be the form of the State autocratic, plutocratic or democratic.

Those who look no further back than the nebular mist for the beginning of mankind, readily assume that the individual is the unit of the race, and looking forward, they see the time when all forms of government will reach a climax in pure democracy, the touchstone of which is personal independence, with the significance of sex denied. "Just as many false ideas prevail as to woman's true position in the home as to her status elsewhere. Womanhood is the great fact in her life; wifehood and motherhood are but incidental relations. Governments legislate for men; we do not have one code for bachelors, another for husbands and fathers; neither have the social relations of women any significance in their demands for civil and political rights." (*History of Woman Suffrage.*)

At the core of this error lies a spiritual aspiration. In nature there is no order within which men and women are equal. They are, in all their basic relationships, complementary one to the other. In some departments of human activity men are, by virtue of their original design, necessitated to play first part, while in other departments women are destined to play first part. But God has an order in which men and women are independent of sex. In the Kingdom of Heaven the individual is the unit, nor is there marrying or giving in marriage. This aspiration is not content to wait for its fruition in the beatitude of the future world, but clamors for recognition within the jurisdiction of Cæsar. And it is in this misdirected passion that is to be found the fountain-spring of the demand on the part of women for political, economic and sex independence.

The proposition that the family is the unit of the body politic is capable of immediate intellectual demonstration. For clearly that is the unity of society on which society naturally and ultimately depends for preservation and perpetuation. For these, society does not depend on the woman alone, nor on the man alone but on the man and woman, "twain made one" for the procreation and education of children. Here we have the family, with the man as head. This ground of right reason is plainly suggested by the Bible account of the creation of our first parents and by Noah's preservation of the pairs, rational and irrational, to reinhabit the earth. If it were permitted to view the family mystically, it would be seen that sex-force is but the positive and negative current uniting, that by secondary creation the earth may be peopled.

No doubt it is profitless to urge the reasons that lie

behind the traditional view that the family alone is *per se* the unit of membership in the State. This view has no favor with those who are bent on setting up a new unit of membership. It does seem, however, worth while to point out the superficial reasoning of those who are putting up a strenuous campaign for woman suffrage. Some time since, in the course of a running debate in one of Boston's dailies, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, replying to the writer's insistence, that, as the family is a moral body, the father as the head is the one qualified by nature to represent it politically, gave off a fling that was supposed to settle the case. She attempted to ridicule the claim that the man by his natural qualifications as head of the family may consistently represent his family as a political unit. "If," argued Miss Blackwell, "the man is at the head of the family, some families have half-a-dozen heads."

In the first place, that five sons, all old enough to vote, sit at the family board with the father, does not alter the fact that one family is at the table. A flippant evasion does not change the organic life of the human race, nor the basic structure of civil society. Secondly, those five sons are potential heads of families naturally destined for that office. This is not true of woman: on the contrary, nature destines her for an entirely different office, one quite incompatible with political equality. Moreover it is well to remember that it is not the individual family that endures from generation to generation, thus preserving the commonwealth; the succession of families preserves society, each actual family presupposing a potential family, each actual head presupposing a potential head, a man. Consequently capable govern-

ments legislate not for men as such, but for men as heads of families.

Besides, existing laws that relate to women are negative proofs in point. The presumption in law is general that "acts done by the wife in the immediate presence of her husband are done by her under coercion from him." The radical programs that demand the exemption of the husband from the liability to support his wife and children and by such demands aim at the destruction of the family, are practical proof that the family is, under the law, habitually recognized as the unit of civil society.

The National President of the Woman Suffrage Association, the Reverend Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, is more brilliant and yet more evasive. After beating the tomtoms for a week before a rally at Faneuil Hall, to secure an opponent in debate, her challenge was accepted at the meeting. The conditions laid down were a marvel of feminine ingenuity. The negative would have fifteen minutes, no more. Besides, the negative must open. The time given was used to show that the propaganda for votes for women was in reality an attack upon the family as the unit of civil society. Good progress was evidently being made, for Miss Shaw was overheard to say: "Stop that woman; she'll win half our audience." So, by the clock opposite the platform, even the fifteen minutes were cut short. Miss Shaw took one hour and three-quarters for her defense, which, by all rules of debate, should have been the affirmative. Imitating the oratory of her opponent with consummate mimicry which was cleverly intended to throw the audience off the scent, the Reverend Doctor won an excited applause from half the house. "My opponent insists that the man is the head of the

family, but everybody knows that the *baby* is the head of the family."

The men who stand for woman suffrage seem afflicted with a like disregard for intellectual virility. Once during a debate in an attempt to break the strength of the conclusion that man was not only in law but in logic the necessary political head of the family, a gentleman of national reputation, said: "There are two heads to my family." In rebuttal, the retort came back: "Indeed! But the family with two heads is a logical monstrosity as a cat with two heads is a physical monstrosity." We may grant that the male half of the *two-headed family* meant to be just. But how just and how gracious the response to a toast by the president of a great industrial plant: "At home I am vice-president." How beautiful, when the home and society are under the government of women, and the family and the State are under the control of men! But the order arising from such conditions will soon vanish, if political equality be granted women; and confusion worse confounded will take the place of the peace which we now enjoy.

IV—ECONOMIC EQUALITY

The hand of rebellion has set down a list of woman's rights in direct opposition to those found in Holy Writ. Consequently the conflict between those who would maintain the family as the unit of civil society and those who insist upon the economic independence of the sexes is as straight as up is from down. The rational human vision, unaided, cuts the issue at right angles, thus separating right reason above from the mental darkness below of those notions which find man's origin to be

mere up-climbing from brute nature. Above, in the light of reason, an ascent to the mountain top may be made to faith in God's word, because it is God's word, here to find in its fulness the genesis of woman's true rights.

Yet the issue waxes hot. Many indeed are, as best they may, modeling their conjugal lives after the perfect family, Joseph, Mary, Jesus. Others are running hither and yon in utter confusion. Still others are stumbling after blind leaders who are victims of a spurious propaganda. But in all charity there are those, a multitude, who scornfully reject the glorious rights of men and women as partakers in God's likeness. They deny that by God's will parents become partners in His power of creation, thus establishing the family as the primordial government on earth. They deny that human rights whether fundamental or consequent on a free act which induces a permanent state such as marriage, carry with them submission to God's authority. So it is that the demand for *economic equality* must be seen at no lesser height nor depth if one would understand its subtle assault upon the moral order.

No other foundation for economic equality can be found save only the assumption that man is a mere evolution from the brute. According to this theory the "tool-using animal" denies any authority save progress for the *mass-man*, over the product of his hands. For the tool-using animal there is neither wife whom he must love as his own flesh, nor children whom he is bound to support. The tool-using animal demands *freedom* not within the scope of man's rational nature but outside the well-established order of Christian civilization.

Plainly, the way to avoid the responsibilities which

hitherto have vexed the tool-using animal of both sexes is to set woman free. Turn her loose upon the world with her natural "trade of motherhood" and let the State nurses train the future citizens. Perhaps, woman's "natural trade" offsets the natural handicap men have in fitness for the economic race. At any rate, the chimera of economic equality rests upon the equal liability of men and women to work within the sphere of commerce. Thus indeed is economic equality the ground of sex independence. The tool-user, man or woman, may answer yes to the question: Shall I not do as I like with my own? But right reason answers, no. For the sex integrity of the family must be preserved, the man's wage must be a family wage.

In the early days the economic aspects of the suffrage propaganda were aristocratic; but since its progress upon more democratic grounds, its inner purport is not so deeply hidden. Not that the old war cry, "taxation without representation is tyranny," has lost its prestige, for strangely enough, it is echoed by shop girls and school teachers in persuading their mates of the alleged justice of the cause. Stranger yet, is it, that it applies as truly to wage-workers as to the propertied class of women, for the simple reason that tax-paying is neither the basis of the franchise nor of governmental representation. Men vote who pay no taxes; while all the men of the party defeated at the polls are without representation, even as to policy. It so falls out that the Wilson Administration does not represent even a majority of those voting in the last national election. Evidently some of the leaders have at last seen the absurdity of their shibboleth, as it disappears from their appeals for votes for women.

Whichever way the argument shifts, political power

was wanted and is wanted to secure equal rights; and the question is more and more insistent: shall the family maintain its state as the economic unit of civilization, or shall the individual be reckoned the unit within the sphere of production for exchange?

It is deeply significant that by their first move to secure economic equality the suffragists made an assault upon the family wage, the wage of men. At the National Labor Union Convention (1868) it was proved that Miss Susan B. Anthony had encouraged girls to serve as strike-breakers at a lower wage in order to learn the printing trade. Miss Anthony stoutly defended her policy as the means by which girls could fit themselves to work *side by side with men* on equal terms.

There is no need to set forth the progress toward "equal pay" for work which has been made since that time, though it should be said that when men insist on doing work best suited to girls, equal pay for equal output should be exacted. It is also necessary to point out that trade union efforts and a better public opinion crystallized into law by men, not votes by women, are improving industrial conditions and advancing the wages of working girls.

Economic equality is urged as the cure for prostitution. But the recent investigation of the National Civic Federation corrects the view that low wages is the cause of trade in lust, while common sense is convinced that wantonness is its cause and chastity its cure, and that religion promotes the purity of women.

At the conclusion of a debate, "Does the wife support the husband or the husband support the wife?" between the most brilliant woman of New England's pantheistic school of thought, Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Stetson Gil-

man, and the president of the National Suffrage Association, the chairman said the debate might be called a "friendly suit." Yes, truly, as both are agreed in demanding the economic emancipation of women and neither maintains that the family is the unit of civil society, economic or otherwise.

Certainly there can be no objection to girls working in those industries suited to their natural and attained capacities; for the brevity of their wage-earning life generally tides them over the time from school to marriage. The objection falls upon married women entering gainful occupations. If all women were to achieve political, economic and sex independence, then indeed, the ideal of the Feminist would come true. There would be public kitchens and State nurseries but no homes, for home is where wife and mother is; if she be not in the house there is no home for husband and children.

It is the irony of fate that although the trade unions have been and are the one powerful agent in maintaining the man's wage as the family wage, they have been enabled to do so only by insisting that women members of the craft shall receive equal pay with men. A special piece of legislation by the Cigarmakers' Union of Boston is worthy of wide publicity. An influx of Belgian craftsmen with their cigar-making wives so crowded the labor market that a law was passed, even with the aid of a very large contingent who declare for woman's rights, excluding from union membership married women whose husbands are not invalids.

Is it not admirable that under the stress of actual experience false philosophies give place to right practices? The suffragists cry for freedom without regard to right relations. But freedom consists in doing what we "ought

to wish to do" and under the moral law we ought to wish to protect the wage of men as a family wage, not to break it down to the status of the individual wage. Freedom is within the moral order, rebellion is outside of it, there is no *ought* in the speech of the materialist philosopher.

Perhaps the strongest indictment against suffragists from an economic standpoint is their proposal to set up the individual in place of the family as the economic unit of society. This would break down the man's wage as the family wage, thus striking at the very foundation of civil society.

V—SPREAD OF SOCIAL DISORDER

Nobody expects a perfect society this side of heaven. But since both philosophy and practice have so far departed from the moral law, and since women seek to enter on equal terms those spheres for which they are disqualified by their physical being and their natural character, it is worth while to contrast the order within the spheres which women dominate with that existing where men hold the reigns of power. Are the home and social intercourse in a better state of morality than commerce and politics?

If the departments of civilized life over which women rule were strictly in order, then, indeed, they might assist in setting to rights man's world, for there is much to be done. Truly, things are due to Cæsar which men deny and things are done to Cæsar that stress and strain the civil peace, while the absence of economic justice sets class against class. Yes, it must be said that both politics and trade are in disorder, but men, not women, should

set them in order. If men should permit their own work to be done by women, and women were able to do it, who then would do the work which women alone are qualified to do?

The Feminists have the answer: they look to see the woman made more of a man and the man more of a woman. Aye! the philosophy of a great English poet has ripened in these sixty years, for the superman will be not only absolutely soulless but practically sexless.

That the woman's world is greatly in disorder no one can deny. Men are helpless before the task of setting it to rights. The nature of the disorders in the home and in society are such that women alone can cope with them. But "votes for women" merely confounds the confusion. Neither can the votes of men reach to the core of the issue, for it lies in the mental and moral fabric of women's weaving. Woman may, if she will, heal the sores that are festering within her own dominion. But if she will, she must call upon the Vicar of Christ for her instruction.

Suffragists have so long been weaving public opinion with the warp of mental rebellion and the woof of sex discontent that the very foundations of our Republic are being sapped, because of the failure of a vast number of women to do the work God set them to do. Even the mention of her natural qualifications and their corresponding activities is vexatious to those most advanced in denying the true mission of woman. Their insistent iteration is for freedom from all the *limitations of convention*. Lacking the structure of logic, they read into the meaning of convention those limitations of sex relations prescribed by nature itself. Moreover, as a consequence of a lack of interior womanliness that is com-

elling, our country faces the demoralizing influence of vain women, idle women, selfish women, luxurious women with their real rights contemned and their duties unperformed.

Woman's legitimate rights, as the second term of mankind, give her control of the home and of society, and her duties are to keep these environments in good order. But the following after strange gods has disordered her provinces and is constantly working havoc to the cause of Christ.

Besides woman's work in the home and in society, she plays a secondary, though very important, part within the civic and exchange spheres. So it is that woman's influence is good or bad in civics and in trade in proportion as she keeps within or exceeds her proper influence within these extended environments.

In the elevated arts, music, painting, architecture, comparisons are invidious, for men are freely at home upon these fields, while women are but occasional comers. But woman, as well as man, has her creative spheres. Her great art is worked out interiorly; in conscious union with the Giver of Life, she molds the future of her unborn children, dedicating her first-born to the especial service of God. Women build in the hearts of the little ones, in the hearts of men, in the world of emotion and intuition. Masculine building, on the other hand, is exterior: men organize governments and build up the intellectual and moral codes that show the designs of Almighty God. Thus, working together in complementary spheres, men and women lay the foundation in the home and build gloriously those nations which honor God.

No votes are needed for the women to set their half of the world in order. Besides, the most fatal disorders are

seen in the home, where even the votes of men are powerless, for men have not in their keeping the chastity of motherhood. It was to Our Blessed Mother that God gave the custody of the Redeemer who was to appear. It is the woman who commits that abomination of desolation, murder of the unborn child, the most ruthless crime ever devised by the ingenuity of wickedness. Votes are not wanted to prevent another vile practice, which leading suffragists advocate. Votes are not wanted to give good care to helpless infants in squalid homes, but rather the early conviction of the mother that a child is a gracious gift from God, and a drill in the best practices known in the care of babies. Votes are not wanted to cure the incorrigible children who crowd our juvenile courts, but, rather, good government at home, where parents are commissioned by the Judge of judges. Votes are not wanted to clear our streets of hoodlums, but mothers who do not harken to evil counsels. Votes are not wanted to solve the servant-girl problem which is left all untouched while a multitude of illogical women pester men for votes that women need as much as the moon and are as well equipped to use as the baby is to handle the carving-knife. Votes are not wanted to protect the housemaids to whom the wages of sin make a most successful appeal, but rather a training of the young men in the family in Christian chivalry which guards defenseless girls even against their own desires. Votes are not wanted for the prudent spending of the husband's wages in the market place, but rather a sober sense of the fitness of things, which adjusts one's expenditure to one's income. Votes are not wanted to shame the rich bargain-hunter, but rather a sense of fair-play, demanding measure for measure in economic value. Votes are not wanted to better

conditions and raise wages for girls working in shops and factories, but a right public opinion.

Neither are votes wanted to empty those theaters and moving-picture houses where pleasure-seekers are gorged with the vile trash they feed upon. Women support, largely, the "problem plays" with their false mental concepts and emotions reeking with the sweat of lust. The daughters of mothers are there with their mothers, together breathing in the fire of sex rebellion. The "best sellers" are bought with hard-earned cash of husbands and fathers, and read, seducing the mind and capturing the fancy for a life the opposite to that of wholesome ideals. Newspapers carry into every home the most shocking tales of disordered families and social scandals, together with the vagaries of the so-called science of our day, which finds the "same root for man and brute," to borrow a great Pope's phrase. In the ball-room good women stand unabashed in scandalous attire, while luxurious women spare no pains in their appeal to the sensuous in mankind. The tango teas bring heart to heart the panting prig and the newest girl, both bred in the atmosphere of a soft and decadent environment, lurid with passions uncontrolled. On the street, one may be at pains to discover the line between the woman in self-conscious scarlet and the woman merely in the garb of fashion. Vice in schools astounds and alarms the sober-minded. But sex hygiene and eugenics are preparing a stench not yet endured, while the school strike is but a ripe fruit of the revolt against the moral order which subjects children to parental control. For the rod has been long since spared and many a child has long since been spoiled in that home where "the baby is the head of the family," because the father has abdicated his author-

ity and the mother has forgotten that under God she stands at the head in the home.

These disorders within the spheres that women dominate cannot be cured by creating new ones within those departments under the rightful control of men; they must be cured by protecting the family as the unit of society.

VI—RIGHT REASON THE CURE

Much of the opposition to woman suffrage has been as trivial or false as are the representations in its favor; and this irritant has reacted in favor of the propaganda of votes for women. Superficial objections are exasperating even to women of ordinary culture having a conscious sense of the dignity of their human nature and an interior conviction that social disorder is not past cure. To object to women voting on the silly pretext of the time it takes to drop a piece of paper in a box down-town, is to arouse their contempt for conservatism in general. This is a grave matter, for upon the popular contempt for what is medieval has been set up this false standard: What is new is good and what is old is bad, merely because it is no longer new. By going over to the evolutionists' camp, women, disgusted by silly objections, swell the army of those who take it for granted that this false hypothesis is scientifically demonstrable. No, the rock of right reason is not split, it cannot be, but the enemy, departing from it, pitch their camp upon the sands. These cultists have an arbitrary starting point: nowhere. They read the origin of the race in a painful uplifting on his hind legs of the beast which through eons of progress became the tool-using animal of today,

and is evolving towards greater perfection. What the final outcome will be only the idealists see in suprasensible vision. Yet it is their fixed conviction that the human being is all incomplete. So, logically from this false reasoning a multitude have taken as their god progress, going somewhere: just where is a mental delirium.

Fortunately these up-to-date folk find their progress barred by the real conservatives, those who accept the truth that while God's design of the cosmos is complete, the phenomena of the human world roll on from one historic epoch to another with never a change in the basic nature of mankind, and never a change in those fundamental laws which we are bound to obey because our Creator imposed them upon us. Hence we may make progress in good by obedience to God's law, or progress in evil by disobedience to God's law. Of course, Catholics have no difficulty on this score; we know we shall arrive, ultimately, at one place or the other, heaven or hell. But, as progress is but a process, the question is whither do we want to go, while yet under the law of Cæsar? Into greater disorder? If not, we must defend marriage as a Sacrament; taking steps to recover the moral ground already lost by Cæsar and we must devise new measures for safeguarding domestic integrity.

Conservatism does not mean stagnation, but an active defense of what is old and good and a spirited advance in what is new and good. All human doors are indeed open to error, but we should be able to distinguish between mere matters of public policy and movements in defiance of the Decalogue; between free trade or protection which a nation may adopt without the violation of basic rights, political or economic, and Socialism which cannot be endorsed without the violation of our natural

right to private property in land and capital. So, too, we should be able to distinguish between widowed mothers' pensions which preserve the home to broken families and woman suffrage which invades the political integrity of families.

However trivial many objections to woman suffrage, there are others sweeping in character yet utterly useless. To refuse the vote on the ground of inferior intelligence is an outrage to woman's nature, and it breeds sex rebellion. It has set up the endless iteration that men, stupid men at that, make the laws which class women with the irresponsible members of the community, children, paupers, idiots, criminals. The question of woman's rights has been confounded with the question of votes for women and the battle has waxed hot and furious, these many years, upon this impossible ground of adjustment. Woman's rights are hers by the gift of God, and are protected at the Court of Rome. But votes for women is a plank in rebellion's platform made by those who scorn Rome and condemn the moral order by presuming an independence of the sexes which right reason cannot tolerate. Human intelligence is necessarily through the male and female structures, and the form of these structures being unlike, but perfectly complementary, should show and does show that the male intelligence and the female intelligence follow necessarily upon the functions naturally and basically in operation within the complementary fields of life work. It is not then a question of equal intelligence or of equal rights or of equal duties, but rather, if I may so express it, a question of male and female rights and duties within those spheres of operation native to man and to woman, and the basic cooperation between the intelligent halves of the one race.

It should be simple enough that the norm for measuring the intelligence of women is not the same as that by which man's intelligence is judged; unless we are willing to be classed at the level of the wit of the old woman who, insisting that "a pint's a pound the world around," gave the hunter a pint of buckshot for the price of a pound.

If only God and Cæsar were better served, votes for women could gain no foothold. God put man at the head of the family and woman at the head of the home. If the natural law is violated, we must suffer the consequences, for human nature is self-assertive. If men lose the heroic, we must expect women to be strident, thus maintaining a complementary, though very unlovely, difference between the sexes. What a sinking at the heart of those who love democracy when, to the clamor of suffragists, men consent: "Let them have it, if they want it!" What an appalling misery is in store for our young Republic when the standard of statesmanship is no higher than the intelligence of the straw vote, taken in a shoe factory, in favor of the extension of suffrage to women! Since when did a right public opinion, for leadership in new ventures, go to people less qualified to decide fundamental matters of statecraft? Truly the charm of spurious philosophy has become well-nigh suffocating when men born to better things cry out: "It's coming, so what's the use?" So it is that arm in arm feminine men and masculine women make progress on the road from bad to worse.

Shall then, the forces of evil work greater havoc to our national stability with never a stouter battle in its defense? Shall the cry for an impossible political equality, economic equality and for sex freedom drown out the voice of right reason?

Catholics do not embrace divorce because the monster is coming our way. No, loyal to God's law, they form the one impregnable fortress against the final assault upon the marriage bond. So, too, they are found defending the outer forts, builded by God's Providence, for the protection and maintenance of the family. For right reason demands that to Cæsar be given what belongs to Cæsar, well-ordered families, men in command of politics and commerce, while women lead at home and in social intercourse.

But should Catholic women go to the polls where women have a vote? The answer is plainly, yes. In case the political unity of the family has been disrupted, Catholic women may make use of the franchise to stay further encroachments upon the moral and economic integrity of the family which is included in the program of the Socialist-Feminist-Suffragist leaders. God disposes even though the devil proposes.

Since individuals live and thrive with numerous physical, mental and moral ills, so, too, does our country thrive though afflicted with social disorders. But, as we strive to throw off our individual disorders, so it were worse than folly to aid votes for women.

Somebody has cited our divorce laws in proof that this is a Protestant country. And reasoning rightly, it will be seen that woman suffrage is but a further extension of that rebellion inaugurated more than three hundred years ago against the moral order as instituted by Christ Our Lord.

The refusal to disrupt one family, that of Henry VIII, cost Rome a nation. In this country, where Catholics withstood the influence of the withering yet fine scorn of the Transcendentalists, it cannot be conceded that real

Christians will now succumb to the psychology of their successors, free-thought leaders, in state-wide application of the doctrines which failed at Brook Farm. Plainly, it is the privilege, as well as the duty, of those who stand upon the rock of right reason to insist that under the moral law the family, not the individual, is the unit of the State.

SHOULD CATHOLIC WOMEN VOTE?

By E. C.

"Why does not the Catholic press support woman suffrage?" asks a contributor. How can the Catholic press consistently ally itself with a movement which has sprung from anti-Catholic sources, and is supported almost entirely by anti-Catholic bodies? It appears "all the forces of evil are arrayed against" the suffragist, and the help of the Catholic press is desired to obtain "votes for women." If Catholic women want to fight "all the forces of evil," why do they not rally to the standard of the Catholic press? Their support, moral, social and financial, their interest, zeal and enthusiasm are woefully needed. If the Catholic suffragist believes "votes for women" merely a political issue, why try to drag the Church into it? If she admits it is a moral and religious issue as well, how can she consistently belong to a party whose aims and ambitions are utterly at variance with the teachings of the Catholic Church? What strange creatures we women are! Shall we arm with the sword of truth and righteousness to gain a wooden wand? Shall we deck ourselves with the "pearl of great price" to win a brass ring for our noses?

How Satan must smile at the thought of the "intelligence" and "purity" of the women that are going to "vanquish" him by means of the vote! The devil fears no woman who fights with merely human weapons. He knows how much of the greatly-vaunted "purity" of Eve's daughters is the result of mankind's instinct to barricade the child-bearing sex from the evils rife in this devil-harried planet. How he must smile as he sees the modern Eve peering wistfully over her barricade at the "man's world" beyond, while with curious fingers she assiduously picks at the hard-caked clay of "ignorance," and exults as the heavy logs of "prejudice" and "man-made laws" topple down before her vigorous onslaughts! It is the mighty feminine intellect, forsooth, that is to put him to rout! The same old sins, pride of intellect and disobedience to God's laws! All that was needed was the same old weapon of "flattery," the same old lure of "god-like power" and "knowledge of good and evil," and how Eve tramples poor, stupid, blundering Adam's "tyranny" under foot and holds out both hands for the prize!

There is only one woman the devil fears; only one whose purity blinds him, whose intellect confounds him, over whose immaculate soul he never had and never can have sway, "Mary, the pattern of humility," the Virgin and Mother of Nazareth who quietly went about her duties in the household. Let the Catholic woman who yearns to fight "the forces of evil" emulate the second great Mother of humanity, not the first. Satan himself hesitates to approach the threshold of a good home. Eve, tell me this: if Adam slips and falls in the mud, what good will that "scrap of paper," the ballot, do you?

New

PIC

Among

W. INTER
MISSION

333 Pag

Price \$

PIC

Telling
raisonne
extra. W

LOR

By

Me

A fasc
ents of
Kentucky

ISAAC

DISCOVERED

by T. J.

55 Pac

ons. L

een si

up, deck

dition

flexible p

amped

up, deck

ostage

Volur

most

Of sp
rested
c., Po

THE

New Prices for These Books

PIONEER PRIESTS OF NORTH AMERICA

By T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Volume I

Among the Iroquois

AN INTERESTING STORY OF THE
MISSIONARIES AMONG THE
IROQUOIS

333 Pages, 27 Illustrations

Price \$1.50, Postage extra

Volume II

Among the Hurons

TELLS THE HEROIC STORY OF DE
BRÉBEUF AND HIS ASSO-
CIATES

480 Pages, 24 Illustrations

Price \$1.50, Postage extra

Volume III

Among the Algonquins

THE ETHNIC GROUP THAT
FIGURED MORE THAN ANY
OTHER INDIAN FAMILY

336 Pages, 22 Illustrations

Price \$1.50, Postage extra

All three volumes together for \$4.25

PIONEER LAYMEN OF NORTH AMERICA

A New Historical Study by T. J. Campbell, S.J.

Telling the fascinating story of the adventurous Cartier, Menendez, Champlain, De La Tour, LaSalle, La Moine and Radisson. 300 Pages. 16 Illustrations. Price \$1.75. Postage extra. Weight 32 ounces.

LORETTO

Annals of
the Century

A Book of Historical Interest

By ANNA C. MINOGUE

Introduction by the
Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D.D.
Archbishop of St. Louis

A fascinating narrative of the accomplish-
ments of the pioneer Catholic women of
Kentucky.

300 Pages, 21 Illustrations

Price 50c., Postage extra

LIFE AND LETTERS OF

Henry Van Rensselaer

Priest of the Society of Jesus

By EDWARD P. SPILLANE, S.J.

Second Edition—Enlarged and Revised

Develops Father Van Rensselaer's public
record, and gives a fuller presentation of his
life in the priesthood.

350 pages, illustrated. Price 75c., Postage extra

ISAAC JOGUES

DISCOVERER OF LAKE GEORGE
By T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

55 PAGES. 9 ILLUSTRATIONS. Leatherette, 25c;
green silk cord, gilt
top, deckled edge, 50c;
édition de luxe, full
flexible green cowhide,
stamped with gold, gilt
top, deckled edge, \$1.00.
Postage extra

THE NAMES OF GOD

AND

Meditative Summaries of the Divine Perfection

By the Venerable Leonard Lessius, S.J.

Translated by T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Although written three hundred years ago this
book has never before been translated into English.

248 Pages, large type, with Portrait. Price 50c.

Postage extra.

Life of Venerable Philippine Duchesne

Founder of the
American Mission
of the daughters
of the Sacred
Heart, one of the
intrepid pioneers
in the winning of
the West to the
Faith. Cloth.

25c. Postage extra

Socialism

Volume of Ten Excellent Essays by Fore-
most Catholic Writers. All Written in
a Concise and Popular Style

280 Pages

Of special service to those who are in-
terested in the great issue of the day. Price,
50c., Postage extra.

The Church and Social Problems

Creating Widespread Discussion

By JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

Associate Editor of AMERICA

A valuable handbook for those wishing to
know the reasons why Socialism is antagonistic
to the principles of Christianity and good
citizenship.

Price \$1.00, Postage extra.

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York

AMERICA

A Catholic Review of the Week

EVERYONE who wishes to form a sound opinion on the great questions of the day; to keep a record of religious progress; and to know the real position of the Church in the thought and activity of modern life should read AMERICA's defence of Catholic doctrine built up every week by skilful hands in every region of the globe. Bureaus of information in the leading cities of Europe, Mexico, Central and South America supply prompt and correct information concerning Catholic interests.

Since AMERICA was established, from every section of the country have come the most flattering commendations, all voicing the sentiment that Catholics in the United States at last have a general representative organ. This is the time therefore to put an end forever to the taunt that Catholics will not enthusiastically support a worthy Catholic periodical.

The Editors are the following priests of the Society of Jesus:

RICHARD H. TIERNEY
JOSEPH HUSSLEIN
WALTER DWIGHT

J. HARDING FISHER
JOHN C. REVILLE
PAUL L. BLAKELY

Subscription Postpaid:

Four months' trial subscription, \$1.00
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00 (16s.)

Judge for yourself—send for a sample copy

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS

59 East 83d Street

New York